arXiv:1401.6043v2 [math.CA] 30 Mar 2015

MASS CONCENTRATION IN A NONLOCAL MODEL OF CLONAL SELECTION

JAN-ERIK BUSSE[2], PIOTR GWIAZDA[1] AND ANNA MARCINIAK-CZOCHRA[2]

[1]INSTITUTE OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND MECHANICS,
UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW,
UL. BANACHA 2, WARSAW 02-097, POLAND

[2]INSTITUTE OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS
INTERDISCIPLINARY CENTER FOR SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING (IWR),
AND BIOQUANT
UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG,
IM NEUENHEIMER FELD 294,
69120 HEIDELBERG, GERMANY

Abstract. Self-renewal is a constitutive property of stem cells. Testing the cancer stem cell hypothesis requires investigation of the impact of self-renewal on cancer expansion. To understand better this impact, we propose a mathematical model describing dynamics of a continuum of cell clones structured by the self-renewal potential. The model is an extension of the finite multicompartment models of interactions between normal and cancer cells in acute leukemias. It takes a form of a system of integro-differential equations with a nonlinear and nonlocal coupling which describes regulatory feedback loops in cell proliferation and differentiation process. We show that such coupling leads to mass concentration in points corresponding to maximum of the self-renewal potential and the model solutions tend asymptotically to Dirac measures multiplied by positive constants. Furthermore, using a Lyapunov function constructed for a finite dimensional counterpart of the model, we prove that the total mass of the solution converges to a globally stable equilibrium. Additionally, we show stability of the model in space of positive Radon measures equipped with flat metric. The analytical results are illustrated by numerical simulations. integro-differential equations and mass concentration and Lyapunov function and selection process and clonal evolution and cell differentiation model and bounded Lipschitz distance

1. Introduction

This paper is devoted to analysis of a structured population model describing clonal evolution of acute leukemias. Leukemia is a disease of the blood production system leading to extensive expansion of malignant cells that are non-functional and cause impairment of blood regeneration. Recent experimental evidence indicates that the cancer cell population are composed of multiple clones consisting of genetically identical cells [Ding et al. 2012] and maintained by cells with stem-like properties [Bonnet 1997, Hope et al. 2004]. Many authors have provided evidence for the heterogeneity of leukemic stem cells (LSC) attempting to identify their characteristics, for review see

[Lutz et al. 2012]. This heterogeneity is further supported by the results of gene sequencing studies [Ding et al. 2012, Ley et al. 2008]. However, it was shown in those studies that very few clones contribute to the total leukemic cell mass. At most 4 contributing clones were detected in case of acute myeloid leukemia (AML) and at most 10 in case of acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL) [Ding et al. 2012, Lutz et al. 2012]. Moreover, in most cases of ALL, the clones dominating relapse have already been present at diagnosis but undetectable by routine methods [Van Delft et al. 2011, Choi et al. 2007, Lutz et al. 2013]. Due to quiescence, very slow cycling or other intrinsic mechanisms,
[Lutz et al. 2013, Choi et al. 2007] these clones may survive chemotherapy and eventually expand [Lutz et al. 2013, Choi et al. 2007]. This implies that the main mechanism of relapse in ALL might be based on a selection of existing clones and not an acquisition of therapy-specific mutations [Choi et al. 2007]. Similar mechanisms have been described for AML [Ding et al. 2012, Jan 2013].
Based on these findings the evolution of malignant cells can be interpreted as a selection process of cells with properties that enable them to survive treatment and to expand efficiently. The mechanism of the underlying process and its impacts on the disease dynamics and on the response of cancer cells to chemotherapy are not understood. Gene sequencing studies allow to decipher the genetic relation between different clones, nevertheless the impact of many detected mutations on cell behaviour remains unclear [Ding et al. 2012]. The multifactorial nature of the underlying processes severely limits the intuitive interpretation of experimental data.
To investigate the impact of cell properties on multi-clonal composition of leukemias and elucidate possible mechanisms of the clonal selection suggested by the experimental data, a multi-compartmental model was proposed and studied numerically in [Stiehl et al. 2014]. It takes the form of the following system of ordinary differential equations,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}c_1(t) &= \big(2a^c s(t)-1\big)p^c c_1(t)\\
\frac{d}{dt}c_2(t) &= 2\big(1-a^c s(t)\big)p^c c_1(t) - d_2^c c_2(t)\\
\frac{d}{dt}l_1^1(t) &= \big(2a^{l^1} s(t)-1\big)p^{l^1} l_1^1(t)\\
\frac{d}{dt}l_2^1(t) &= 2\big(1-a^{l^1} s(t)\big)p^{l^1} l_1^1(t) - d_2^{l^1} l_2^1(t)\\
&\vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \qquad (1)\\
\frac{d}{dt}l_1^n(t) &= \big(2a^{l^n} s(t)-1\big)p^{l^n} l_1^n(t)\\
\frac{d}{dt}l_2^n(t) &= 2\big(1-a^{l^n} s(t)\big)p^{l^n} l_1^n(t) - d_2^{l^n} l_2^n(t)\\
s(t) &= \frac{1}{1+K^c c_2(t)+K^l\sum_{i=1}^n l_2^i(t)},
\end{aligned}
$$

supplemented with nonnegative initial data.

The model describes time dynamics of a healthy cell line, denoted by c_j, $j = 1, 2$ and of n clones of leukemic cells l^i_j, for $j = 1, 2$, and $i = 1, ..., n$, at time t. Each population consists of two different cell types, proliferating and non-proliferating, denoted by $j = 1$ and $j = 2$ respectively. This two-compartment model is a simplification of a more realistic model with multiple differentiation stages; see Ref. [Marciniak-Czochra et al. 2009, Stiehl et al. 2013] for the model introduction and the application to healthy hematopoiesis, Ref. [Getto et al. 2013, Nakata et al. 2011, Stiehl 2011] for its analysis and Ref. [Doumic et al. 2011] for a continuous-structure extension. This model can be seen as a structured population model with a discrete structure describing 2 differentiation stages and $n + 1$ cell types.

Parameters $p^c > 0$ and $p^{l^i} > 0$ denote the proliferation rate of healthy cells and cells in leukemic clone i, respectively. a^c and a^{l^i} are the corresponding maximal fractions of self-renewal, which reflect the proportion between symmetric and asymmetric cell divisions in the respective population. More precisely, the self-renewal fractions $0 < a^c < 1$ and $0 < a^{l^i} < 1$ describe the fractions of progeny cells which remain in the compartment of proliferating cells. Consequently, $(1 - a^c)$ and $(1 - a^{l^i})$ fractions of the dividing cells differentiate and become non-proliferating. By $d^c_2 > 0$ and $d^{l^i}_2 > 0$ we denote the clearance rate of non-proliferating healthy cells and cells of leukemic clone i, respectively.

The model is based on the assumption that leukemic clones and their normal counterparts depend on hematopoietic feedback signalling and compete for signalling factors (cytokines). We assume that the feedback signal, $s(t)$, decreases if the number of non-proliferating cells increases. The derivation of such nonlinear feedback loop was proposed in [Marciniak-Czochra et al. 2009]. It results from a Tikhonov-type quasi-stationary approximation of dynamics of the extracellular signalling molecules, such as G-CSF cytokine, which are secreted by specialised cells at a constant rate and degraded by receptor mediated endocytosis. Following the evidence from clinical trials that the mature granulocytes mediate clearance of G-CSF [Layton et al. 1989], we assume that dynamics of the signalling molecules depends on the number of non-proliferating cells. This assumption has been also supported by studies of receptor expression showing that mature cells express significantly more receptors than the cells in bone marrow [Shinjo et al. 1997]. Taking into account these observations, we obtain a model with a nonlinear coupling depending on the level of non-proliferating cells.

Numerical simulations of model (1) suggest that cells with superior self-renewal potential, i.e. maximal value of the parameter a, reflecting the probability that a daughter cell has the same properties and fate as its parent cell, have an advantage in comparison to their counterparts, which leads to expansion of this cell subpopulation [Stiehl et al. 2014]. The phenomenon was shown analytically solely in the case of two competing populations, the healthy and the cancerous cell line, in Ref. [Stiehl 2012].

To elucidate further mechanisms of clonal selection, we propose an infinitely dimensional extension of the multi-compartment model (1). We introduce a continuous variable $x \in \Omega$ that represents the expression level of genes (yielding a phenotype) influencing self-renewal properties of the cells. It leads to a system of integro-differential equations describing dynamics of a structured population with continuum of cell clones and two-compartment differentiation structure. Cells in

Population 1 (dividing cells) proliferate and may self-renew or differentiate into Population 2 cells (differentiated cells); while Population 2 cells do not proliferate and die after an exponentially distributed lifetime, see Fig. 1. Cells in both populations are stratified by a structure variable x. We assume that the self-renewal parameter depends on x, i.e. the parameter a becomes a function $a(x)$. These assumptions lead to the model

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}u_1(t,x) &= (2a(x)s(t)-1)\,pu_1(t,x), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t}u_2(t,x) &= 2\,(1-a(x)s(t))\,pu_1(t,x) - du_2(t,x), \\ u_1(0,x) &= u_1^0(x), \\ u_2(0,x) &= u_2^0(x), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where taking

$$s(t) = 1/(1+K\int\limits_{\Omega} u_2(t,x)\mathrm{d}x)$$

results in a nonlocal and nonlinear coupling of the two equations.

Our approach is motivated by the theory of mutation-selection in adaptive evolution. Cells with different mutations might possess different growth properties allowing them to expand more efficiently. The phenomenon is closely related to the process of Darwinian evolution, according to which certain rare mutants may have positive growth rates and be selected in environments that would otherwise result in ecological extinction. In this view, cells with a fitness advantage may expand and dominate dynamics of the whole population leading to extinction of other cell clones. The proposed model belongs to a class of selection models exhibiting mass concentration effect, similar to those studied in [Perthame 2007].

In the current work, we do not model mutations. Motivated by the experimental findings described above [Lutz et al. 2013, Choi et al. 2007], we rather aim to understand which aspects of the dynamics of leukemias can be explained by a selection process alone. It is interesting, since expansion of a clone at relapse that could not be detected at diagnosis due to limited sensitivity of methods can be misinterpreted as occurrence of mutations [Choi et al. 2007].

The mathematical interest of our study is in the analysis of nonlocal effects and development of singularites in integro-differential equations. We show that solutions of (2) may tend to Dirac measures concentrated in points with the largest value of self-renewal potential. Such dynamics can be interpreted as a selection process, in which heterogeneous initial data converge to a stationary solution with the mass localised on a set of measure zero.

Similar results have been recently shown for some scalar equations including diffusion, see for instance [Barles 2008, Barles et al. 2009, Lorz et al. 2011, Lorenzi et al. 2013] and [Lorz et al. 2013] for a model with additional space structure. The equations studied in [Lorz et al. 2013, Lorenzi et al. 2013] have been also applied to address cancer heterogeneity, and influence of the selection process on cancer resistance to chemotherapy. The novelty of our work is in considering a two-dimensional system of equations. Difficulty of the analysis is related to the specific nonlinearities in the model, which do not allow for component-wise estimates. The proof of boundedness of mass in scalar equations is based on existence of sub- and supersolutions. In case of a system, we face a difficulty which appears already in the proof of



FIGURE 1. Schematic representation of model 2, consisting of two compartments corresponding to undifferentiated cells (dividing cells) and mature cells (differentiated cells). Undifferentiated cells (stem cells and early progenitors) divide symmetrically or asymmetrically. Consequently, they produce cells of the same type (self-renewal process) and mature cells (differentiation). Mature cells do not divide and they die after an exponentially distributed lifetime. The cells in each compartment are heterogenous. They are stratified by a structure variable x that represents the expression level of genes (yielding a phenotype and eg. influencing self-renewal properties of cells). Self-renewal and differentiation of cells are regulated by cytokine feedback which, in turn, depends on the total count of differentiated cell.

boundedness of solutions of a structure-independent model. The estimates cannot be concluded directly from the equations. To tackle this problem, we investigate dynamics of the quotients of solutions of the two variables. Systems of equations provide also additional difficulties in analysis of long-term dynamics in comparison to scalar equations due to lack of a rich class of entropies. Convergence to a stationary positive Radon measure has been previously studied for a scalar integro-differential equation which is linear in the nonlocal term, see [Jabin et al. 2011]. This is often referred to as Evolutionary Stable Distribution. To deal with model nonlinearities, we make use of a Lyapunov function established previously for a finite dimensional counterpart of the model [Getto et al. 2013] and show that total masses of the solutions tend asymptotically to the same equilibria.

The phenomenon of mass concentration provides a motivation to consider the model in the space of positive Radon measures, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\mu_1(t) &= \left(\frac{2a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)} - 1\right) p\mu_1(t), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\mu_2(t) &= 2\left(1 - \frac{a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)}\right) p\mu_1(t) - d\mu_2(t), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

with

$$\rho_i(t) = \int_\Omega \mathrm{d}\mu_i(t), \quad i = 1, 2, \tag{4}$$

supplemented with the initial data

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1(0) &= \mu_1^0, \\ \mu_2(0) &= \mu_2^0, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $\mu_i 0$ are nonnegative Radon measures for $i = 1, 2$; $x \in \Omega$ denotes the state of an individual and, for every Borel set $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, with $n = \dim(\Omega)$, $\mu(t)(A) = \int_{\{A\}} d\mu(t)$ is the measure of cells being in state $x \in A$ at time t. ρ_i denotes, then, the mass of all cells from the $i-th$ compartment.

We show that the results obtained for the integro-differential equations (2) can be extended to model (3), since the initial data in the space of positive Radon measures can be approximated with respect to flat metric by continuous functions. Flat metric has proven to be useful in analysis of a variety of transport equations models, for example to study Lipschitz dependence of solutions of nonlinear structured population models on the model parameters and initial data [Gwiazda et al. 2010, Carillo et al. 2012]. The results on stability in the space of positive Radon measures equipped with flat metric allow for developing a stable numerical algorithm based on particle methods, similar to that applied in [Carillo et al. 2012] and [Gwiazda et al. 2013] for structured population models. In addition, considering the space of positive Radon measures with an appropriate metric allows formulating the result on convergence of solutions to a stationary measure in the terms of the metric instead of weak$*$ convergence of Radon measures.

The paper is organised as follows: In Section 2, main results of this paper are formulated. Analytical results are illustrated by numerical simulations. Proofs of the results on boundedness and strict positivity of total masses and exponential decay of solutions of model (2) outside the set corresponding to the maximal value of self-renewal parameter are presented in Section 3. Section 4 is devoted to a proof of convergence of the mass to a globally stable equilibrium. Finally, the proof of asymptotic dynamics of model solutions is given in Section 5. Additionally, in Section 6, we show how to extend analysis of our model to the framework of differential equations in the space of positive Radon measures with appropriate metric. Summary of properties of flat metric applied in Section 5 and Section 6 is provided in the Appendix.

2. Main results

We consider the following system of integro-differential equations

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u_1(t,x) &= \left(\frac{2a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)}-1\right)pu_1(t,x),\\
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u_2(t,x) &= 2\left(1-\frac{a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)}\right)pu_1(t,x)-du_2(t,x),\\
u_1(0,x) &= u_1^0(x),\\
u_2(0,x) &= u_2^0(x),
\end{aligned}
\tag{6}
$$

where

$$\rho_i(t)=\int_\Omega u_i(t,x)\,\mathrm{d}x,\quad \text{for}\quad i=1,2$$

and $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}$ open and bounded.

In the remainder of this work we make the following assumptions on the model parameters and initial data.

Assumption 1. (i) *$a\in C(\overline{\Omega})$ with $\frac{1}{2}<a<1$ and $\overline{\Omega}$ being a closure of Ω.*

(ii) *p, d and K are positive constants.*

(iii) *$u_1^0,u_2^0\in L^1(\Omega)$ and u_1^0 is strictly positive a.e. with respect to Lebesgue measure, i.e. $\int_A u_i^0dx>0$ for every set A such that $\mathcal{L}^1(A)>0$, $i=1,2$.*

(iv) *The set of maximal values of the self-renewal parameter a, i.e.*

$$\Omega_a=\arg\max_{x\in\overline{\Omega}}a(x)=\left\{\bar{x}\in\overline{\Omega}\,\middle|\,a(\bar{x})=\max_{x\in\overline{\Omega}}a(x)\right\}\tag{7}$$

consists of a single point or it is a set with positive Lebesgue measure.

Remark 2.1. *The assumption (i) and (iv) on the self-renewal fraction $a(x)$ are made to streamline the presented analysis.*

1. *If $a(x)\le\frac{1}{2}$ for some points $x\in\Omega$, the solutions of the model converge pointwise to zero, which is a straightforward consequence of Eq. (6). Therefore, we are interested in evolution of the system with $a(x)>\frac{1}{2}$. The subpopulations with $a(x)\le\frac{1}{2}$ could affect short time dynamics of the whole system, however they have no influence on the asymptotic behaviour of the model.*

2. *If Ω_a consists of several isolated points, then the solution is attracted by finite dimensional subspace spanned by Dirac deltas located at the maximum points of a, see Fig. 3. However, in this case the exact pattern may also depend on the shape of function $a(x)$ near its maximal points. We skip this case in analytical considerations.*

Existence and uniqueness of a classical solution $u=(u_1,u_2)\in C^1([0,T),L^1(\Omega)\times L^1(\Omega))$ follow by the standard theory of ordinary differential equations in Banach spaces. More delicate is the question of asymptotic behaviour of the solutions of

system (6). Our goal is to show that the solution u tends asymptotically to some stationary measure, as it is observed in numerical simulations, see Fig. 2 and Fig. 3. The phenomenon is characterised by the following Theorem.

Theorem 2.2. *Let Assumptions 1 hold and let (u_1, u_2) be a solution of (6). Then, both u_1 and u_2 converge to stationary measures with the support contained in the set Ω_a defined in (7), as t tends to infinity. Moreover,*

(i) *If Ω_a consists of a single point $\bar{x}$, then the solution converges to a stationary measure (Dirac measure multiplied by a positive constant) concentrated in $\bar{x}$. The convergence holds in flat metric (bounded Lipschitz distance); see Appendix for definition and properties of bounded Lipschitz distance.*

(ii) *If Ω_a is a set with positive measure and $\int_{\Omega_a} u_1^0(x)\mathrm{d}x > 0$, then the solution converges to a stationary L^1-function, such that $\lim_{t\to+\infty} u_1(t,x) = cu_1^0(x)\mathbb{1}_{\Omega_a}$, where $\mathbb{1}_{\Omega_a}$ is the characteristic function of the set Ω_a and c is a positive constant. The convergence is strong in $L^1(\Omega)$.*

Details of the proof are presented in Section 3 and Section 4. The proof is based on the following key steps:

Step 1. Showing uniform boundedness and strict positivity of masses $\rho_i(t) = \int_\Omega u_i(t,x)\,\mathrm{d}x$ for $i = 1, 2$ (Lemma 2.3)

Lemma 2.3. *Let Assumptions 1 (i)-(iii) hold and let (u_1, u_2) be a solution of (6), then both ρ_1 and ρ_2 are uniformly bounded and strictly positive.*

The proof of this lemma is deferred to Section 3.1.

Step 2. Showing exponential extinction of solutions in points outside the set Ω_a (Lemma 2.6).

To show asymptotic behaviour of model solutions, we start with characterising the asymptotic behaviour of fractions of solutions taken at different x points.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $x_1, x_2 \in \overline{\Omega}$ such that $a(x_1) - a(x_2) < 0$. Then, there exists a constant $M_3 > 0$ such that*

$$\frac{u_1(t,x_1)}{u_1(t,x_2)} \leq \frac{u_1^0(x_1)}{u_1^0(x_2)} e^{p\frac{2(a(x_1)-a(x_2))}{1+KM_3}t} \overset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0,$$

a.e. with respect to Lebesgue measure.

Lemma 2.4 yields the following result:

Corollary 2.5. *Let $x_1, x_2 \in \overline{\Omega}$ such that $a(x_1) = a(x_2)$. Then, $\frac{u_1(t,x_1)}{u_1(t,x_2)}$ is constant in time.*

As a consequence of Lemma 2.4 we obtain also

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 (i) - (iii) hold. Then, $u(t,x) \to 0$, exponentially, as $t \to \infty$ for $x \notin \Omega_a$ a.e. with respect to Lebesque measure.*

The respective proofs are presented in Section 3.2.

Step 3. Showing convergence of solutions to stationary measures.

Convergence of solutions to stationary ones follows from the property of total masses of the solutions $(\int_\Omega u_1(t,x)\mathrm{d}x, \int_\Omega u_2(t,x)\mathrm{d}x)$. We show that they converge to stationary values, which correspond to the stationary state of the system with $\bar{a} = \max_{x\in\overline{\Omega}} a(x)$.

Theorem 2.7. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 hold and* $(\rho_1,\rho_2) = (\int_\Omega u_1(\cdot,x)\mathrm{d}x, \int_\Omega u_2(\cdot,x)\mathrm{d}x)$ *be total masses of solutions of* (6)*. It holds* $(\rho_1(t),\rho_2(t)) \to (\bar{\rho}_1,\bar{\rho}_2)$*, as* $t\to\infty$*, where* $(\bar{\rho}_1,\bar{\rho}_2)$ *are stationary solutions of the corresponding ordinary differential equations model with the maximal value of the self-renewal parameter* $\bar{a} = \max_{x\in\overline{\Omega}} a(x)$*, i.e.,*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left(\frac{2\bar{a}}{1+K\bar{\rho}_2} - 1\right) p\bar{\rho}_1, \\ 0 &= 2\left(1 - \frac{\bar{a}}{1+K\bar{\rho}_2}\right) p\bar{\rho}_1 - d\bar{\rho}_2. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

(9)

Details of the proofs on mass convergence are deferred to Section 4.

If Ω_a consists of a single point $\bar{x}$, then the exponential decay of solutions outside the set Ω_a together with convergence of total masses yield convergence of solutions to a stationary measure concentrated at $\bar{x}$ (a Dirac measure multiplied by a positive constant). In case of Ω_a having a positive Lebesgue measure, convergence of solutions together with Corollary 2.5 concerning the stationary distribution of masses between different domain points yield convergence of solutions to stationary equilibria. Further details of the proof of convergence of solutions to stationary measures are given in Section 5.

Remark 2.8. *In case* $\Omega_a = \{\bar{x}\}$*, the convergence holds in weak* topology of Radon measures. In general, we cannot expect the strong (norm) convergence of the solution to a stationary solution. If the set* $\Omega_a \subset \mathbb{R}^1$ *has zero Lebesgue measure and consists of a single point (compare Assumptions 1 (iv)), the model solutions for any finite time point* $\mu(t)$ *are uniformly continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure* $\mu << \mathcal{L}^1$ *and* $\mu \to c\delta_{\bar{x}}$ *weakly*. Hence, the distance between the two solutions* $TV(\mu, c\delta_{\bar{x}}) \geq 2c$*. The problem can be solved by considering convergence with respect to an appropriate metric, for example flat metric (bounded Lipschitz distance), for details see Section 5.*

Remark 2.9 (*Co-existence of different stationary solutions*)**.** *If the support of the limit solution is not a connected set, then the stationary distribution of masses is not unique and depends on initial conditions. This fact can be observed on the example with the self-renewal function* $a(x)$ *achieving its maximum in a discrete set of points, which results in the model equilibrium in the form of linear combination of Dirac deltas, see Fig 3. In such case the limit function depends on the shape of* $a(x)$ *in the neighbourhood of the concentration points.*



FIGURE 2. Numerical simulations of model (6) with the self-renewal function $a(x)$ having a single local maximum (shown in the upper panel). Parameters used in the simulation: $K = 0.01$, $p = 1$, $d = 0.2$ and the initial data: $u_1^0(x) = 1000 - 500x$, $u_2^0(x) = 1000x^2$. We observe mass concentration in the point $\bar{x} = \arg\max_{x\in\Omega} a(x)$ and convergence of the mass to a stable stationary value.



FIGURE 3. Numerical simulations of model (6) with the self-renewal function $a(x)$ having two equal local maxima (shown in the upper panel) and the parameters the same as in Fig. 2. We observe mass concentration in the two points corresponding to the maximum in the function $a(x)$ with unequal distribution of the mass between the two points.

2.1. **Biological implications.** Our results suggest that the selection process may be governed by the cell's property of self-renewal. This ability determines the fitness of each cell and ultimately leads to survival or extinction. Theorem 2.2 shows that, in a well-mixed cell production system, a negative nonlinear feedback such as that proposed in [Marciniak-Czochra et al. 2009, Lander et al. 2009, Lander 2009] leads to the selection of the subpopulation with the superior self-renewal potential. The assumption that the cell population is well-mixed leads to the nonlocal effect and is modelled using the integral term. This assumption reflects well the structure of blood system.

Consequently, our results suggest that the greater clonal heterogeneity observed in solid cancers than in blood cancers may be due to spatial effects in cell-cell interactions. Furthermore, the results stress the importance of self-renewal in cancer dynamics and allow concluding that slowly proliferating cancer cells are able to explain clinical dynamics and observations such as treatment resistance. The importance of this observation in the context of leukemia evolution, response to chemotherapy and dynamics of the disease relapses is discussed in [Stiehl et al. 2014]. The results obtained allow explaining recent experimental results on clonal selection in AML (acute myeloid leukemia) during disease development and relapse after chemotherapy [Ding et al. 2012].

3. Proof of mass concentration

3.1. **Boundedness and positivity of masses.** All considerations in this Section hold for $x \in \Omega$ a.e. with respect to Lebesque measure.
Before proving Lemma 2.3 we show the following technical result.

Lemma 3.1. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.3, the function $U = \frac{u_1}{u_2}$ is uniformly bounded on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+$.*

Proof. The equation for $U(t,x) = \frac{u_1(t,x)}{u_2(t,x)}$ reads for $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}U(t,x) &= U(t,x)\Bigg(p\left(\frac{2a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)}-1\right)+d \\ &\qquad -2p\left(1-\frac{a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)}\right)U(t,x)\Bigg). \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Since

$$p\left(\frac{2a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)}-1\right)+d \le 2p\bar{a}+d$$

and

$$1-\frac{a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)} > 1-\bar{a},$$

and the right-hand side of (10) is a logistic type nonlinearity, we conclude that

$$U(t,x) \le \max\left\{U(0,x), \frac{2p\bar{a}+d}{2p(1-\bar{a})}\right\} =: M_1 \quad \forall\,(t,x)\in[0,T)\times\Omega.$$

By definition of U we can infer that

$$u_1(t,x) \le M_1 u_2(t,x) \quad \forall\,(t,x)\in[0,T)\times\Omega.$$

□

As a straightforward consequence of Lemma 3.1, we deduce

Corollary 3.2. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.3, it holds*

$$\int_\Omega u_1(t,x)\,\mathrm{d}x \le M_1 \int_\Omega u_2(t,x)\,\mathrm{d}x = M_1\rho_2(t). \tag{11}$$

of Lemma 2.3. (i) First, we show uniform boundedness of masses ρ_1 and ρ_2, which yields also the global existence of solutions $(u_1,u_2)\in C^1([0,\infty),L^1(\Omega)\times L^1(\Omega))$.

To show boundedness of ρ_1, we apply inequality (11) to the first equation of (6)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u_1(t,x) &= \left(\frac{2a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)}-1\right)pu_1(t,x) \le \left(\frac{2a(x)}{1+\frac{K}{M_1}\rho_1(t)}-1\right)pu_1(t,x)\\ &\le \left(\frac{2\bar a}{1+\frac{K}{M_1}\rho_1(t)}-1\right)pu_1(t,x).\end{aligned}$$

Integrating this inequality with respect to x yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_1(t) \le \left(\frac{2\bar a}{1+\frac{K}{M_1}\rho_1(t)}-1\right)p\rho_1(t). \tag{12}$$

Similarly as in the proof of Lemma 3.1, we conclude that

$$\rho_1(t) \le \max\left\{\rho_1(0), \frac{(2\bar a-1)M_1}{K}\right\} =: M_2. \tag{13}$$

Boundedness of ρ_2 results from the second equation of (6), nonnegativity of ρ_2 and the assumptions on a. It holds

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u_2(t,x) = 2\left(1-\frac{a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)}\right)pu_1(t,x) - du_2(t,x) \le 2pu_1(t,x) - du_2(t,x).$$

Integrating over Ω and using (13), we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_2(t) \le 2p\rho_1(t) - d\rho_2(t) \le 2pM_2 - d\rho_2(t).$$

Hence, we conclude that

$$\rho_2(t) \le \max\left\{\rho_2(0), \frac{2pM_2}{d}\right\} =: M_3. \tag{14}$$

(ii) Now, we show that the masses ρ_1 and ρ_2 are strictly positive.
For this purpose we state another technical result in the spirit of Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.3. *There exists a constant $M_4>0$ and $0<\gamma<1$ such that $\rho_2(t)\le M_4\rho_1^\gamma(t)$ for all $t\ge 0$.*

Proof. Calculating the derivative of the quotient of these two quantities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\frac{\rho_2(t)}{\rho_1^\gamma(t)} &= \frac{\frac{d}{dt}\rho_2(t)\rho_1^\gamma(t) - \rho_2(t)\gamma\rho_1^{\gamma-1}(t)\frac{d}{dt}\rho_1(t)}{\rho_1^{2\gamma}(t)} \\
&= \frac{\int_\Omega 2\left((1-\frac{a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)})pu_1(t,x) - du_2(t,x)\right)\,\mathrm{d}x}{\rho_1^\gamma(t)} \\
&\quad -\frac{\rho_2(t)}{\rho_1^\gamma(t)}\frac{\gamma\int_\Omega\left(\frac{2a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)}-1\right)pu_1(t,x)\,\mathrm{d}x}{\rho_1} \\
&\leq \frac{\int_\Omega\left(2(1-\frac{a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)})pu_1(t,x) - du_2(t,x)\right)\,\mathrm{d}x}{\rho_1^\gamma(t)} + \frac{\rho_2(t)}{\rho_1^\gamma(t)}\gamma p \\
&\leq 2p\rho_1^{1-\gamma}(t) + \frac{\rho_2(t)}{\rho_1^\gamma(t)}(\gamma p - d) \leq 2pM_2^{1-\gamma} + \frac{\rho_2(t)}{\rho_1^\gamma(t)}(\gamma p - d).
\end{aligned}$$

This estimate holds for arbitrary γ, so in particular for those satisfying $\gamma p - d < 0$. Arguing as before, we deduce that for all $t \geq 0$

$$\frac{\rho_2}{\rho_1^\gamma}(t) \leq \max\left\{\frac{\rho_2(0)}{\rho_1^\gamma(0)}, \frac{2pM_2^{1-\gamma}}{d-\gamma p}\right\} =: M_4.$$

□

Equipped with Lemma 3.3, we estimate the growth of ρ_1 using the first equation of (6), after integrating it over Ω.

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_1(t) = \int_\Omega\left(\frac{2a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)}-1\right)pu_1(t,x)\,\mathrm{d}x \geq \left(\frac{2\underline{a}}{1+KM_4\rho_1(t)^\gamma}-1\right)p\rho_1(t),$$

where $\underline{a} = \min_{x\in\overline{\Omega}} a(x)$.

The term in brackets is strictly positive for ρ_1 small enough, i.e. for

$$\rho_1(t) \leq \left(\frac{2\underline{a}-1}{KM_4}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}},$$

which is a positive constant, since $\underline{a} > \frac{1}{2}$ due to Assumptions 1 (i).

Hence, we conclude about the strict positivity of ρ_1. More precisely, we obtain the estimate

$$\rho_1(t) \geq \min\left\{\rho_1(0), \left(\frac{2\underline{a}-1}{KM_4}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}\right\} \quad \forall\, t\in[0,\infty) =: M_5.$$

Furthermore, using the second equation of (6), we obtain also the strict positivity of ρ_2. □

3.2. **Asymptotic behaviour of solutions.** In the next step, we show that the first component of the solution of (6) tends to zero for $\bar{x} \notin \Omega_a$ a.e. with respect to Lebesque measure.

of Lemma 2.4. We choose two points $x_1, x_2 \in \overline{\Omega}$ such that $a(x_1) - a(x_2) < 0$, and calculate

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\frac{u_1(t,x_1)}{u_1(t,x_2)} = p\frac{u_1(t,x_1)}{u_1(t,x_2)}\left(2\frac{a(x_1)-a(x_2)}{1+K\rho_2(t)}\right) \leq p\frac{u_1(t,x_1)}{u_1(t,x_2)}\left(2\frac{a(x_1)-a(x_2)}{1+KM_3}\right).$$

Solving the above ordinary differential equation for $\frac{u_1(t,x_2)}{u_1(t,x_2)}$, we obtain the assertion of this Lemma by the choice of x_1 and x_2. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let $x_1, x_2 \in \overline{\Omega}$ be such that $a(x_1) - a(x_2) < 0$, then*

$$\frac{u_2(t,x_1)}{u_2(t,x_2)} \overset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0,$$

a.e. with respect to Lebesque measure.

Proof. We use a similar ansatz as in Lemma 2.4 and calculate for $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\frac{u_2(t,x_1)}{u_2(t,x_2)} &= 2\left(1-\frac{a(x_1)}{1+K\rho_2(t)}\right)p\frac{u_1(t,x_1)}{u_2(t,x_2)} \\ &\quad -2\left(1-\frac{a(x_2)}{1+K\rho_2(t)}\right)p\frac{u_2(t,x_1)}{u_2(t,x_2)}\frac{u_1(t,x_2)}{u_2(t,x_2)}.\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 2.4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\frac{u_2(t,x_1)}{u_2(t,x_2)} &= p\frac{u_1(t,x_2)}{u_2(t,x_2)}\left(2\left(1-\frac{a(x_1)}{1+K\rho_2}\right)\frac{u_1^0(x_1)}{u_1^0(x_2)}e^{\frac{2(a(x_1)-a(x_2))t}{1+KM_3}}\right. \\ &\quad \left. -2\left(1-\frac{a(x_2)}{1+K\rho_2}\right)\frac{u_2(t,x_1)}{u_2(t,x_2)}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can deduce the following bound for $\frac{u_2(t,x_1)}{u_2(t,x_2)}$

$$\frac{u_2(t,x_1)}{u_2(t,x_2)} \leq \frac{\left(1-\frac{a(x_1)}{1+KM_3}\right)\frac{u_1^0(x_1)}{u_1^0(x_2)}e^{\frac{2(a(x_1)-a(x_2))t}{1+KM_3}}}{1-a(x_2)},$$

where the right hand side tends exponentially to zero, as t tends to infinity. This concludes the proof. □

Having shown the dynamics of the quotients between solutions at different x points, we can prove that the solutions converge to zero outside the set of points with a maximal value of the parameter $a(x)$.

of Lemma 2.6. Let $\tilde{x}$ be a point different that $\bar{x}$ and assume that $\lim_{t\to\infty} u(t,\tilde{x}) > 0$. Continuity of $a(x)$ implies that the set of x, such that $a(x) > a(\tilde{x})$, is an open nonempty set and, therefore, it has a positive measure. Since Lemma 2.4 holds for every $x, \tilde{x} \in \overline{\Omega}$ such that $a(x) - a(\tilde{x}) > 0$, we conclude that $u(t,x)$ tends exponentially to $+\infty$ for every x such that $a(x) > a(\tilde{x})$. This is, however, in contradiction with the uniform boundedness of mass $\int_\Omega u(t,x)\mathrm{d}x$. □

4. Proof of convergence of the total mass

We begin the proof of Theorem 2.7 by showing the following lemma, which allows comparing two dynamical systems.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $u : \mathbb{R}^+ \to (\mathbb{R}^+)^2$ be a solution of*

$$\frac{du}{dt} = F(u)$$

with a globally stable stationary solution $\bar{u}$ and let $V \in C^1((\mathbb{R}^+)^2)$ be a Lyapunov function for this equation with compact level sets and the minimum δ achieved at the stationary solution $\bar{u}$. If $\tilde{u}$ is a solution of

$$\frac{d\tilde{u}}{dt} = F(\tilde{u}) + f,$$

where $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$, then $\tilde{u} \to \bar{u}$ for $t \to \infty$.

Proof. We consider the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{du(t)}{dt} &= F(u(t)), \\ u(0) &= u^0, \end{aligned}$$

with a unique globally stable stationary solution $\bar{u}$ and assume that $V \in C^1((\mathbb{R}^+)^2)$ is a strict Lyapunov function for this equation. It holds

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dV(u)}{dt} &< 0, \\ \frac{dV(u)}{dt} &= 0 \iff u = \bar{u}, \\ V(\bar{u}) &= \delta \end{aligned}$$

and V has compact level sets.
Let $\tilde{u}$ be a solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\tilde{u}(t)}{dt} &= F(\tilde{u}(t)) + f(t), \\ \tilde{u}(0) &= u^0, \end{aligned}$$

where $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^+)$.
For arbitrary $a > \delta$, we define a cutting function

$$V_a(u) := \begin{cases} V(u) - a & if \quad V(u) \geq a, \\ 0 & if \quad V(u) < a. \end{cases}$$

Since $V_a \in W^{1,\infty}(U)$, where $U \subset (\mathbb{R}^+)^2$, $\mathrm{Im}(\tilde{u}) \in U$ and $\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{u} \in L^1(\Omega)$, then we can define the time derivative of $V_a(\tilde{u}(t))$ based on the chain rule. $\nabla_{\tilde{u}} V_a(\tilde{u})$ is defined in classical sense only outside the curve $V(\tilde{u}(t)) = a$, but it has Clarke derivative (generalised subdifferential for a locally Lipschitz function, [Clarke 1983]) on the curve $V = a$.
In the following, in notion of $\nabla_{\tilde{u}} V_a(\tilde{u})$ we extend the classical definition with the maximal element of the Clarke derivative on the set where the classical derivative is not defined.

Furthermore, for the cutting function V_a and any strictly positive function $\beta(V_a)$, there exists a positive constant $\tilde{\beta}_a$ such that $\beta(V_a) \geq \tilde{\beta}_a V_a$. Hence, we obtain

$$\frac{dV_a(\tilde{u}(t))}{dt} \leq -\tilde{\beta}_a V_a(\tilde{u}(t)) + \nabla_{\tilde{u}} V_a(\tilde{u}(t)) \cdot f(t), \tag{15}$$

where the right-hand side is a L^1-function. Using compactness of the level sets, we estimate $\nabla_{\tilde{u}} V_a(\tilde{u}(t))$ by its L^∞ norm, which yields the following inequality,

$$\frac{dV_a(\tilde{u}(t))}{dt} \leq -\tilde{\beta}_a V_a(\tilde{u}(t)) + C|f|,$$

where $C = \|\nabla_{\tilde{u}} V(\tilde{u}(t))\|_{L^\infty}$.
Integrating the above estimate, we obtain

$$V_a(\tilde{u}(t)) \leq V_a(u_0) e^{-\tilde{\beta}_a t} + \int_0^t |f| e^{-\tilde{\beta}_a (t-\tau)} d\tau.$$

Since, by definition, $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$, we conclude that $V_a(u(t)) \to 0$ for $t \to \infty$. The convergence holds for every a which yields convergence $V(u(t)) \to \delta$, which is the minimum of the function V. In turn, it ensures that $u(t) \to \bar{u}$. □

of Theorem 2.7. To apply Lemma 4.1 to our system (6), we consider a finite dimensional model obtained by setting $a(x)$ to a constant value a

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} v_1 &= \left(\frac{2a}{1 + K v_2} - 1 \right) p v_1, \\ \frac{d}{dt} v_2 &= 2 \left(1 - \frac{a}{1 + K v_2} \right) p v_1 - d v_2, \\ v_1(0) &= v_1^0, \\ v_2(0) &= v_2^0. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

A Lyapunov function for this system has been constructed in [Getto et al. 2013]. It takes the form

$$V(v_1, v_2) := \frac{1}{p G(\bar{v}_2)} V_1(v_1, v_2) + \frac{1}{d} V_2(v_1, v_2), \tag{17}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V_1(v_1, v_2) &:= \frac{v_1}{\bar{v}_1} - 1 - \ln \frac{v_1}{\bar{v}_1}, \\ V_2(v_1, v_2) &:= \frac{v_2}{\bar{v}_2} - 1 - \frac{1}{\bar{v}_2} \int_{\bar{v}_2}^{v_2} \frac{G(\bar{v}_2)}{G(\xi)} d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

$(\bar{v}_1, \bar{v}_1)$ is the stationary solution and

$$G(v_2) := 2 \left(1 - \frac{a}{1 + k v_2} \right) \text{ for } v_2 \geq 0. \tag{18}$$

Compactness of level sets of V follows from uniform boundedness of model solutions. Direct calculations, presented in [Getto et al. 2013], allow to check that

$$\frac{d}{dt} V(v_1(t), v_2(t)) \leq 0. \tag{19}$$

We define

$$\Sigma := \left\{ (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 | v_1 > 0, v_2 > 0 \right\}, \tag{20}$$

$$E := \left\{ (v_1(t), v_2(t)) \in \overline{\Sigma} \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} V(v_1(t), v_2(t)) < +\infty, \\ \\ \frac{d}{dt} V(v_1(t), v_2(t)) = 0 \end{array} \right\}$$

where $\overline{\Sigma}$ is the closure of Σ. Let M be the maximum invariant set in E. Then M consists of the positive equilibrium. By La Salle's invariance principle, we conclude that every solution in Σ tends to M. Thus, the positive equilibrium of (16) is globally attractive.
To show convergence of the total mass of a solution of (6) to a global equilibrium, we integrate the equations of (6) with respect to x and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\rho_1(t) &= \int_\Omega \left(\frac{2a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)} - 1 \right) p u_1(t,x) \mathrm{d}x, \\ \frac{d}{dt}\rho_2(t) &= 2\int_\Omega \left(1 - \frac{a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)} \right) p u_1(t,x) \mathrm{d}x - d\int_\Omega u_2(t,x)\mathrm{d}x, \\ \rho_1(0) &= \int_\Omega u_1^0(x)\mathrm{d}x, \\ \rho_2(0) &= \int_\Omega u_2^0(x)\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

This can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\rho_1(t) &= \left(\frac{2\tilde{a}}{1+K\rho_2(t)} - 1 \right) p\rho_1(t) + \frac{2p}{1+K\rho_2(t)} \int_\Omega (a(x)-\tilde{a})\, u_1(t,x)\mathrm{d}x, \\ \frac{d}{dt}\rho_2(t) &= 2\left(1 - \frac{\tilde{a}}{1+K\rho_2(t)} \right) p\rho_1(t) \\ &\quad + \frac{2p}{1+K\rho_2(t)} \int_\Omega (\tilde{a}-a(x))\, u_1(t,x)\mathrm{d}x - d\rho_2(t), \\ \rho_1(0) &= \int_\Omega u_1^0(x)\mathrm{d}x, \\ \rho_2(0) &= \int_\Omega u_2^0(x)\mathrm{d}x, \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where $\tilde{a}$ is a constant value.
Taking $\tilde{a} = \bar{a}$, we show that the two systems (16) and (22) fulfill the assumptions of Lemma 4.1 and therefore solutions of (22) converge to the stationary solution of (16) with $a = \bar{a}$. Consequently, we conclude that the total mass of (6) converges to a globally stable equilibrium, which is equal to the equilibrium of ordinary equations model (16) with the maximal value of self-renewal parameter $\bar{a}$.

To show that the perturbation function on the right-hand side is indeed L^1-function, we estimate

$$\int_\Omega (a(x)-\tilde{a})\, u_1(t,x)\mathrm{d}x = \int_{\Omega_a} (a(x)-\tilde{a})\, u_1(t,x)\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega\setminus\Omega_a} (a(x)-\tilde{a})\, u_1(t,x)\mathrm{d}x,$$

where Ω_a is defined in (7) Consequently, using boundedness of ρ_1, boundedness of $a(x)$ as well as Lemma 2.6, we obtain that

$$\int_\Omega (a(x)-\tilde{a})\, u_1(t,x)\mathrm{d}x \overset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0,$$

and hence we conclude that f is a L^1-function of time and system (22) fulfills the assumptions of Lemma 4.1. Thus, we have proven the assertion of the theorem. □



FIGURE 4. Using the trapezoidal rule to approximate the integral $\rho_1(t), \rho_2(t)$, we can observe numerically the convergence of the total mass to a constant value. The parameter set is the same as in Figure 2.

5. Proof of the convergence result

Finally, we obtain our main assertion.

of Theorem 2.2. Lemma 2.6 implies that the solution of system (6) decays exponentially to zero in all points $x \notin \Omega_a$. We consider two cases (compare Assumptions 1 (iv)):

(i) $\Omega_a = \{\bar{x}\}$:
Convergence to a stationary solution follows from the convergence of mass given by Theorem 2.7. Hence, the solutions converge to measures concentrated at $\bar{x}$:

$$u(t,x) \overset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} c\delta_{\bar{x}},$$

where $\delta_{\bar{x}}$ is a Dirac measure localised at $\bar{x}$ and c is a positive constant due to the positivity of masses.

The convergence result can be understood in an appropriate metric on the space of positive Radon measures. We apply here the flat metric ρ_F,

known also as a bounded Lipschitz distance [Neunzer 1981]. For completeness of presentation, we provide in Appendix the definition and basic properties of this metric.

To estimate the distance between a solution $u(t,x)$ and the stationary measure $c\delta_{\bar{x}}$, we use the following inequality for the distance of two measures μ_1 and μ_2

$$\rho_F(\mu_1,\mu_2) \leq min\{\rho_1,\rho_2\} W_1(\frac{\mu_1}{\rho_1},\frac{\mu_2}{\rho_2}) + |\rho_1-\rho_2|. \tag{23}$$

For the proof of this inequality we refer to [Carillo et al. 2012] and [Jabłoński 2013].

Here $W_1(\frac{\mu_1}{\rho_1},\frac{\mu_2}{\rho_2})$ denotes Wasserstein distance between two probabilistic measures, for which we use Lipschitz test functions. Namely, $W_1 : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^+)\times\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^+) \longrightarrow [0,\infty]$ in its dual representation is defined by

$$W_1(\nu_1,\nu_2) \quad := \quad \sup\ \Big\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \psi\ d(\nu_1-\nu_2) \ \Big|\ \psi\in C^1(\mathbb{R}^+),\ \ \mathrm{Lip}\,\psi \leq 1 \Big\}.$$

The first term on the right hand-side of (23) can be estimated using exponential estimates from Lemma 2.4, which allows concluding about its convergence to zero. Convergence of the second term comparing the two masses is due to Theorem 2.7. Hence, we obtain that

$$\rho_F(u(t,x),\delta_{\bar{x}}) \leq k(t),$$

where $k(t)$ is monotone, nonnegative and $\lim\limits_{t\to+\infty} k(t) = 0$.

(ii) $\mathcal{L}^1(\Omega_a) > 0$:
If Ω_a is a set with positive measure, no singularites emerge due to the uniform boundedness of the total mass. In this case, the solution tends to zero outside Ω_a and to a positive L^1-function on Ω_a. Following Corollary 2.5, we conclude that the exact shape of the limit solution depends on the initial distribution.

□

6. Extension to initial data in space of Radon measures

Convergence of the model solutions to Dirac deltas motivates formulation of the model in the space of positive Radon measures given by equations (3). In this section we show how to extend our results to this framework.

A general idea to tackle problem (3) is to regularise the initial data to obtain a system of ordinary differential equations defined in Banach space $L^1(\Omega)\times L^1(\Omega)$ given by (6). It can be achieved using a smoothing kernel $(\delta_\varepsilon)\subset C^\infty(\Omega)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta_\varepsilon(x) := \varepsilon^{-n}\delta(\frac{\varepsilon}{x}),\\ &\int_\Omega \delta(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Taking $(u^0)^\varepsilon(x) := \mu_1^0 * \delta_\varepsilon$ leads to (6) with u^ε being a solution for $(u^0)^\varepsilon$, i.e.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u_1^\varepsilon(t,x) = \left(\frac{2a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)} - 1\right) p u_1^\varepsilon(t,x), \tag{25}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u_2^\varepsilon(t,x) = 2\left(1 - \frac{a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)}\right) p u_1^\varepsilon(t,x) - d u_2^\varepsilon(t,x), \tag{26}$$

$$u_1^\varepsilon(0,x) = (u_1^0)^\varepsilon(x), \tag{27}$$

$$u_2^\varepsilon(0,x) = (u_2^0)^\varepsilon(x), \tag{28}$$

where

$$\rho_i(t) = \int_\Omega u_i(t,x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1,2.$$

Since system (3) defined on the space of nonnegative Radon measures exhibits Lipschitz dependence of solutions on the initial data with respect to a suitably chosen metric, eg. the flat metric, we can pass to the limit in the approximate equations and obtain a solution of the original problem that exhibits the same dynamics.

We apply the flat metric for the analysis of problem (3), since it allows for approximation of the initial data, which cannot be achieved in the strong topology of Radon measures. Furthermore, $(\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}+), \rho_F)$ is a complete space, which is convenient for proving convergence results, see Appendix for more details.

We show that solutions of (25) converge for $\varepsilon \to 0$. For this we prove that u^ε are Cauchy sequences.

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose $(u_1^{\varepsilon_n}, u_2^{\varepsilon_n})$ and $(u_1^{\varepsilon_m}, u_2^{\varepsilon_m})$ being solutions of (6) for the initial data $((u_1^0)^{\varepsilon_n}, (u_2^0)^{\varepsilon_n})$ and $((u_1^0)^{\varepsilon_m}, (u_2^0)^{\varepsilon_m})$, respectively. Then, it holds*

$$\rho_F((u_1^{\varepsilon_n}, u_2^{\varepsilon_n}), (u_1^{\varepsilon_m}, u_2^{\varepsilon_m})) \le e^{\int_0^t \alpha(s)\,\mathrm{d}s} \rho_F(((u_1^0)^{\varepsilon_n}, (u_2^0)^{\varepsilon_n}), ((u_1^0)^{\varepsilon_m}, (u_2^0)^{\varepsilon_m})),$$

for some function $\alpha : \Omega \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Let $u = (u_1^{\varepsilon_n}, u_2^{\varepsilon_n})$ and $\tilde{u} = (u_1^{\varepsilon_m}, u_2^{\varepsilon_m})$ denote the solutions of the initial value problem (6) with $u^0 = ((u_1^0)^{\varepsilon_n}, (u_2^0)^{\varepsilon_n})$ and $\tilde{u}^0 = ((u_1^0)^{\varepsilon_m}, (u_2^0)^{\varepsilon_m})$, respectively. If we interpret the regular solutions u and $\tilde{u}$ as densities of measures, we can write them as

$$u\lambda = (u_1\lambda, u_2\lambda), \quad \tilde{u}\lambda = (\tilde{u}_1\lambda, \tilde{u}_2\lambda),$$

where λ stands for the Lebesgue measure. Denoting

$$f_1(\rho_2) = \left(\frac{2a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)} - 1\right) p \ \text{ and } \ f_2(\rho_2) = 2p\left(1 - \frac{a(x)}{1+K\rho_2(t)}\right),$$

we see that both f_1 and f_2 are Lipschitz-continuous functions on some interval $[0, M_3]$.

Using equations (6), Lipschitz-continuity of f_1 and the assumption that $\bar{\varphi} = \varphi f_1 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\rho_F(u_1\lambda, \tilde{u}_1\lambda) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\sup\left\{\int_\Omega \varphi \mathrm{d}(u_1\lambda - \tilde{u}_1\lambda)(x) \,\middle|\, \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \le 1\right\} \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\sup\left\{\int_\Omega \varphi(u_1 - \tilde{u}_1)\mathrm{d}\lambda \,\middle|\, \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \le 1\right\} \\
&= \sup\left\{\int_\Omega \varphi(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u_1 - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\tilde{u}_1)\mathrm{d}\lambda \,\middle|\, \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \le 1\right\} \\
&= \sup\Bigg\{\int_\Omega \varphi\left(f_1(\rho_2)(u_1 - \tilde{u}_1) + (f_1(\rho_2) - f_1(\tilde{\rho}_2)\tilde{u}_1\right)\mathrm{d}\lambda \\
&\qquad \,\middle|\, \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \le 1\Bigg\} \\
&\le \sup\left\{\int_\Omega \bar{\varphi}\mathrm{d}(u_1\lambda - \tilde{u}_1)\lambda \,\middle|\, \|\bar{\varphi}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \le 1\right\} \\
&\qquad + \|f_1(\rho_2) - f_1(\tilde{\rho}_2)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \sup\left\{\int_\Omega \varphi \mathrm{d}\tilde{u}_1\lambda \,\middle|\, \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \le 1\right\} \\
&\le \frac{1}{C}\rho_F(u_1\lambda, \tilde{u}_1\lambda) + p\,|\rho_2 - \tilde{\rho}_2|\,\rho_F(\tilde{u}_1\lambda, 0).
\end{aligned}$$

Similar calculations yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\rho_F(u_2\lambda, \tilde{u}_2\lambda) &= \rho_F(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u_2\lambda, \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\tilde{u}_2\lambda) \\
&= \rho_F\left((f_2(\rho_2)u_1 - du_2)\lambda, (f_2(\tilde{\rho}_2)\tilde{u}_1 - \mu\tilde{u}_2)\lambda\right) \\
&\le \rho_F(f_2(\rho_2)u_1\lambda, f_2(\tilde{\rho}_2)\tilde{u}_1\lambda) + \mu\rho_F(u_2\lambda, \tilde{u}_2\lambda) \\
&\le \frac{1}{C}\rho_F(u_1\lambda, \tilde{u}_1\lambda) + |\rho_2 - \tilde{\rho}_2|\,\rho_F(\tilde{u}_1\lambda, 0) + d\rho_F(u_2\lambda, \tilde{u}_2\lambda).
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of flat metric, it holds

$$|\rho_2 - \tilde{\rho}_2| \le \rho_F(u_2\lambda, \tilde{u}_2\lambda).$$

Hence, we can infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\rho_F(u_1\lambda, \tilde{u}_1\lambda) + \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\rho_F(u_2\lambda, \tilde{u}_2\lambda) &\le \frac{2}{C}\rho_F(u_1\lambda, \tilde{u}_1\lambda) \\
&\quad + \left(\rho_F(\tilde{u}_1\lambda, 0) + \mu\right)\rho_F(u_2\lambda, \tilde{u}_2\lambda) \\
&\le \max\left\{\frac{2}{C}, \rho_F(\tilde{u}_1\lambda, 0) + d\right\}\left(\rho_F(u_1\lambda, \tilde{u}_1\lambda)\right. \\
&\quad \left. + \rho_F(u_2\lambda, \tilde{u}_2\lambda)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Defining $\alpha(t) := \max\left\{\frac{2}{C}, \rho_F(\tilde{u}_1\lambda, 0) + d\right\}$, we conclude by applying Gronwall's

lemma

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_F(u_1\lambda,\tilde{u}_1\lambda)+\rho_F(u_2\lambda,\tilde{u}_2\lambda) \quad &\leq \quad e^{\int_0^t \alpha(s)\,\mathrm{d}s}\big(\rho_F(u_1(0)\lambda,\tilde{u}_1(0)\lambda)\\ &\quad +\rho_F(u_2(0)\lambda,\tilde{u}_2(0)\lambda)\big)\end{aligned}$$

□

7. Appendix

We present here basic results related to the space of positive Radon measures equipped with flat metric ρ_F, known also as a bounded Lipschitz distance [Neunzer 1981].

Definition 7.1. *Let $\mu,\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^+)$. The distance function $\rho_F : \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^+)\times\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^+)\to[0,\infty]$ is defined by*

$$\rho_F(\mu,\nu) := \sup\Big\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^+}\psi d(\mu-\nu)\big|\ \psi\in C^1(\mathbb{R}^+), \|\psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}}\leq 1\Big\}, \tag{29}$$

where

$$\|\psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}} := \max\{\|\psi\|_\infty, \|\partial_x\psi\|_\infty\}.$$

It metrizes both weak* and narrow topologies on each tight subset of Radon measures with uniformly bounded total variation [Schwartz 1973], [Ambrosio et al. 2000].

Proposition 7.2. *Flat metric satisfies the following properties:*

- *scale-invariance*
$$\rho_F(\theta\cdot\mu,\theta\cdot\nu)=\theta\rho_F(\mu,\nu).$$
- *translation-invariance*
$$\rho_F(T_x\mu,T_x\nu)=\rho_F(\mu,\nu).$$

Completeness of the space $(\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}_+),\rho_F)$ is a result of $(\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}_+),\rho_F)$ being a subspace of $\big(W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+)\big)^*$ and the equivalence of the flat metric convergence and weak* convergence in $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}_+)$, which is complete with respect to weak* convergence. $(\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}_+),\rho_F)\subset\big(W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+)\big)^*$ can be seen by using a standard approximation argument for the test functions and Proposition 7.2.

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_F(\mu,\nu) &= \sup\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}_+}\psi\,\mathrm{d}(\mu-\nu)\,\Big|\psi\in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+),\|\psi\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+)}\leq 1\right\}\\ &= \sup\left\{\frac{1}{\theta}\int_{\mathbb{R}_+}\varphi\,\mathrm{d}(\mu-\nu)\,\Big|\varphi\in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+),\|\varphi\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+)}\leq\theta\right\}\\ &= \|\mu-\nu\|_{(W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+))^*}\end{aligned}$$

Thus the flat metric is the metric induced by the dual norm of $W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ (see e.g. [Gwiazda et al. 2010], [Müller 2004], [Zhidkov 1998]).

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the Collaborative Research Center, SFB 873 'Maintenance and Differentiation of Stem Cells in Development and Disease". AM-C and PG were supported by the grant of National Science Centre No. 6085/B/H03/2011/40. AM-C and J-ES also acknowledge the support of European Science Foundation (Starting Grant No. 210680) and the Emmy Noether Programme of the German Research Council (DFG). The authors thank Frederik Ziebell for help with numerical simulations illustrating the results of this work.

References

[Ambrosio et al. 2000] Ambrosio L, Fusco N, Pallara D (2000) Functions of Bounded Variation and Free Discontinuity Problems. Oxford Math. Monogr.

[Barles 2008] Barles G, Perthame B (2008) Dirac Concentrations in Lotka-Volterra Parabolic PDEs. Indiana U. Math. J. 57(7), pp 3275–3302.

[Barles et al. 2009] Barles G, Mirrahimi S, Perthame B (2009) Concentration in Lotka-Volterra parabolic or integral equations: a general convergence result. Meth. Appl. Anal. (MAA) 16, pp 321–340.

[Bonnet 1997] Bonnet D, Dick J E (1997) Human acute myeloid leukemia is organised as a hierarchy that originates from a primitive hematopoietic cell. Nat Med 3, pp 730-7.

[Carillo et al. 2012] Carrillo J A, Gwiazda P, Ulikowska A (2012) Splitting-Particle Methods for Structured Population Models: Convergence and Applications. Math. Models Meth. Appl. Sci. doi: 10.1142/S0218202514500183.

[Carillo et al. 2012] Carrillo J A, Colombo R M, Gwiazda P, Ulikowska A (2012) Structured populations, cell growth and measure valued balance laws. J. Diff. Eq. 252: pp 3245–3277.

[Clarke 1983] Clarke H (1983) Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis. New York et al., John Wiley & Sons, New York.

[Choi et al. 2007] Choi S, Henderson M J, Kwan E, Beesley E H, Sutton R, Bahar A Y, Giles J, Venn N C, Pozza L D, Baker D L, et al. (2007) Relapse in children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia involving selection of a preexisting drug-resistant subclone. Blood 110, pp 632-9.

[Ding et al. 2012] Ding L, Ley T J, Larson D E, Miller C A, Koboldt D C, Welch J S, DiPersio J F (2012) Clonal evolution in relapsed acute myeloid leukaemia revealed by whole-genome sequencing. Nature 481, pp 506-510.

[Doumic et al. 2011] Doumic M, Marciniak-Czochra A, Perthame B, Zubelli J. (2011) Structured population model of stem cell differentiation. SIAM J. Appl. Math. 71, pp 1918–1940.

[Getto et al. 2013] Getto P, Marciniak-Czochra A, Nakata Y, dM Vivanco M. (2013) Global dynamics of two-compartment models for cell production systems with regulatory mechanisms. Math. Biosci. 245, pp 258-268.

[Gwiazda et al. 2010] Gwiazda P, Lorenz T, Marciniak-Czochra A (2010) A nonlinear structured population model: Lipschitz continuity of measure valued solutions with respect to model ingredients. J. Diff. Eq. 248, pp 2703–2735.

[Gwiazda et al. 2013] Gwiazda P, Jabłoński J, Marciniak-Czochra A, Ulikowska A (2013) Analysis of particle methods for structured population models with nonlocal boundary term in the framework of bounded Lipschitz distance. Numer. Methods Partial Differential Eq. doi: 10.1002/num.21879.

[Hope et al. 2004] Hope K J, Jin L , Dick J E (2004) Acute Myeloid leukemia originates from a hierarchy of leukemic stem cell classes that differ in self-renewal capacity. Nat Immunology 5, pp 738-43.

[Jabin et al. 2011] Jabin P E, Raoul G (2011) On selection dynamics for competitive interactions. Journal of mathematical biology 63.3, pp 493-517.

[Jabłoński 2013] Jabłoński J, Marciniak-Czochra A (2013) Efficient algorithms computing distances between Radon measures on R. Preprint available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1304.3501

[Jan 2013] Jan M, Majeti R (2013) Clonal evolution of acute leukemia genomes. Oncogene 32, pp 135-40.

[Lander 2009] Lander A (2009) The 'stem cell' concept: is it holding us back?. J. Biol., 8(8), pp 70.

[Lander et al. 2009] Lander A, Gokoffski K, Wan F, Nie Q, Calof A (2009) Cell lineages and the logic of proliferative control. PLoS Biology 7: e1000015.

[Layton et al. 1989] Layton J E, Hockman H, Sheridan W P, Morstyn G (1989) Evidence for a novel in vivo control mechanism of granulopoiesis: mature cell-related control of a regulatory growth factor. Blood 74, pp 1303-1307.

[Ley et al. 2008] Ley T J, Mardis E R, Ding L, Fulton B, McLellan M D, Chen K, Dooling D, Dunford-Shore B H, McGrath S, Hickenbotham M, et al. (2008) DNA sequencing of a cytogenetically normal acute myeloid leukaemia genome. Nature 456, pp 66-72.

[Lorz et al. 2011] Lorz A, Mirrahimi S, Perthame B (2011) Dirac mass dynamics in a multidimensional nonlocal parabolic equation. Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 36(6), pp 1071–1098.

[Lorz et al. 2013] Lorz A, Lorenzi T, Clairambault J, Escargueil A, Perthame B (2013) Effects of space structure and combination therapies on phenotypic heterogeneity and drug resistance in solid tumors. arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6237.

[Lorenzi et al. 2013] Lorz A, Lorenzi T, Hochberg M E, Clairambault J, Perthame B (2013) Populational adaptive evolution, chemotherapeutic resistance and multiple anti-cancer therapies. ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis 47.02pp 377-399. ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis 47.02, pp 377-399.

[Lutz et al. 2012] Lutz C, Hoang V T, Buss E, Ho A D (2012) Identifying leukemia stem cells - Is it feasible and does it matter?. Cancer Lett 338, pp 10-14.

[Lutz et al. 2013] Lutz C, Woll P S, Hall G, Castor A, Dreau H, Cazzaniga G, Zuna J, Jensen C, Clark S A, Biondi A, et al. (2013) Quiescent leukaemic cells account for minimal residual disease in childhood lymphoblastic leukaemia. Leukemia 27, pp 1204-7.

[Marciniak-Czochra et al. 2009] Marciniak-Czochra A, Stiehl T, Ho A D, Jäger W, Wagner W (2009) Modeling asymmetric cell division in hematopoietic stem cells—regulation of self-renewal is essential for efficient repopulation. Stem Cells Dev., 18, pp 377–386.

[Müller 2004] Müller S, Ortiz M (2004) On the Γ-convergence of discrete dynamics and variational integrators. J.Nonlinear Sci. 14, pp 279–296.

[Nakata et al. 2011] Nakata Y, Getto P, Marciniak-Czochra A, Alarcon T (2011) Stability analysis of multi-compartment models for cell production systems. J. Biol. Dynamics. Published online: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17513758.2011.558214.

[Neunzer 1981] Neunzer H (1981) An introduction to the nonlinear Boltzmann-Vlasov equation, in Kinetic Theories and the Boltzmann Equation. Springer, Berlin, Lecture Notes in Math. 1048, pp 60–110.

[Perthame 2007] Perthame B (2007) Transport Equations in Biology. Birkhäuser, Basel.

[Schwartz 1973] Schwartz L (1973) Radon Measures. Oxford University Press.

[Shinjo et al. 1997] Shinjo K, Takeshita A, Ohnishi K, Ohno R (1997) Granulocyte colony-stimulating factor receptor at various differentiation stages of normal and leukemic hematopoietic cells. Leuk Lymphoma 25, pp 37-46.

[Stiehl 2011] Stiehl T, Marciniak-Czochra A (2011) Characterization of stem cells using mathematical models of multistage cell lineages. Math. Comput. Modelling 53, pp 1505–1517.

[Stiehl 2012] Stiehl T, Marciniak-Czochra A (2012) Mathematical modelling of leukemogenesis and cancer stem cell dynamics. Math. Mod. Natural Phenomena, 7, pp 166–202.

[Stiehl et al. 2014] Stiehl T, Baran N, Ho A D, Marciniak-Czochra A (2014) Clonal selection and therapy resistance in acute leukemias: Mathematical modelling explains different proliferation patterns at diagnosis and relapse. J. Royal Society Interface, 11, 20140079. http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2014.0079.

[Stiehl et al. 2013] Stiehl T, Ho A D, Marciniak-Czochra A (2013) The impact of CD34+ cell dose on engraftment after Stem Cell Transplantations: Personalized estimates based on mathematical modeling. Bone Marrow Transp. Published online, doi: 10.1038/bmt.2013.138.

[Van Delft et al. 2011] Van Delft F W, Horsley S, Colman S, Anderson K, Bateman C, Kempski H, Zuna J, Eckert C, Saha V, Kearney L, et al. (2011) Clonal origins of relapse in ETV6-RUNX1 acute lymphoblastic leukemia. Blood 117, pp 6247-54.

[Zhidkov 1998] Zhidkov P E (1998) On a problem with two-time data for the Vlasov equation. Nonlinear Analysis 31, pp 537–547.